

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF MISSISSIPPI  
WESTERN DIVISION**

**TARRIUS D. HOLT**

**PLAINTIFF**

**VERSUS**

**CIVIL ACTION NO. 5:15-cv-63-DCB-MTP**

**D.H.O. SGT. UNKNOWN ROWAN, ET AL.**

**DEFENDANTS**

**ORDER**

This cause is before the Court on *pro se* Tarrius D. Holt's letter [10], which the Court construes as a motion to amend. Having considered the motion, the Court concludes as follows.

Plaintiff's letter motion to amend [10] pertains to claims regarding a different series of rules violation reports (RVRs), at a different facility, than the RVRs at issue in his Complaint [1]. The claims set forth in Plaintiff's latest motion are not related to the subject matter of his original complaint. Plaintiff is attempting to assert new claims arising from separate incidents at a different facility. Such claims belong in a separate lawsuit. *See Cockrum v. Carter*, Civil Action No. 13-5329, 2014 WL 1378872 (E.D. La. Apr. 2, 2014)(allowing new claims would unduly burden the defendants and the court); *Parker v. Gusman*, Civil Action No. 11-0638, 2012 WL 7338060 (E.D. La. Nov. 16, 2012)(motion to amend to add new claims denied); *Kron v. Tanner*, Civil Action No. 10-518, 2010 WL 2038168, \*1 (E.D. La. May 20, 2010)("justice does not require that a plaintiff be allowed to continually amend his complaint to add new claims as they occur"). Accordingly, it is hereby

ORDERED that Plaintiff's letter motion to amend [10] is denied.

SO ORDERED, this the 5th day of November, 2015.

s/David Bramlette  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE